1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF OREGON
3	THE HON. ANN L. AIKEN, JUDGE PRESIDING
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
7	Government,)
8	v.) No. 11-cr-60131-AA
9	RONALD D. JOLING and DOROTHEA J.) JOLING,)
10	Defendants.)
11)
12	
13	
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15	EUGENE, OREGON
16	TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2013
17	PAGES 1 - 25
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Kristi L. Anderson Official Federal Reporter
23	United States Courthouse 405 East Eighth Avenue
24	Eugene, Oregon 97401 (541) 431-4112
25	Kristi_Anderson@ord.uscourts.gov

```
1
     APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
 2
 3
     FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
 4
     Scott E. Bradford
     United States Attorney's Office
 5
     405 E. Eighth Avenue
     Suite 2400
 6
     Eugene, OR 97401
     (541) 465-6741
     Fax: (541) 465-6314
     Email: scott.bradford@usdoj.gov
 8
 9
     FOR THE DEFENDANT RONALD D. JOLING:
10
     Mark Bennett Weintraub
     Office of the Federal Public Defender
     859 Willamette Street
11
     Suite 200
12
     Eugene, OR 97401
     (541) 465-6937
13
     Fax: (541) 465-6975
     Email: mark_weintraub@fd.org
14
15
     FOR THE DEFENDANT DOROTHEA J. JOLING:
16
     Emilio F. Bandiero
     Law Office of Emilio F. Bandiero, PC
     975 Oak Street
17
     Suite 625
18
     Eugene, OR 97401
     (541) 344-1637
19
     Fax: (541) 344-2956
     Email: efband@aol.com
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2013

THE CLERK: This is the time set for oral argument in the case of United States of America versus Ronald Joling, Case No. 11-60131 and USA versus Dorothea Joling, Case No. 11-60131.

MR. WEINTRAUB: Good morning, Your Honor. I wonder if I could give the court a little background as to why we are here this morning.

THE COURT: That would be great.

MR. WEINTRAUB: This case has been pending for a long time. I think it's fair to say that the defendants have never happily accepted representation by counsel.

Without getting into the principles that they may hold that are behind that, we have struggled throughout the course of this case with attempting to represent them when they seem to reject the legitimacy of our representation and the system that it's a part of.

We were before Judge Coffin and then Judge Hogan about a year ago with a motion to withdraw and then a Faretta hearing at which the defendants asserted a wish to represent -- or to defend themselves and not be represented by counsel.

Initially Judge Coffin referred that to Judge Hogan. At the first hearing before Judge Hogan, Judge Hogan

asked us to prepare a written declaration for the defendants to sign in support of their request to defend themselves. I prepared that document, but the defendants did not sign it.

I can provide the court with a copy of that if it will be helpful today.

THE COURT: Sure. That would be fine.

MR. WEINTRAUB: We were then before Judge Hogan for a follow-up hearing. I believe Mr. Bradford provided the court with a transcript of that hearing. That was the second of two hearings before Judge Hogan on that issue.

At the conclusion of that hearing, Judge Hogan found that the defendants had not unequivocally expressed a wish to waive their Sixth Amendment right to counsel and represent themselves, and based on that he denied their request.

I told Judge Hogan at that time that I didn't intend to renew the request every time I received another piece of -- another communication from my client purporting to fire me or believing that I had been fired.

And so the matter has then gone on for about another year in that posture.

But the situation for a very long time has been that my client does not speak with me and returns all correspondence that I send to him. The correspondence I receive from him pretty consistently represents that he

believes that I have been fired; that he wants me fired; that he does not believe I am representing him any further.

So it came to a point where I thought we probably should be before the court again to revisit the subject. I think that Mr. Bandiero's situation is largely the same, but I will let him speak for himself.

MR. BANDIERO: Thank you, Your Honor. I represent Mrs. Joling.

The situation is the same with a slight little twist, and that is that the document that Mr. Weintraub prepared at the direction of Judge Hogan, I modified that slightly to indicate — to have her indicate that she was solely and wholly in charge of her decisions. Wasn't my decision. It was not Mr. Joling's decision.

I, as well, have -- my client does not speak with me. I regularly get fired in various forms by letters or declarations or motions, and all of my correspondence is returned with some rubber stamp rejection of -- essentially of my representation.

So we are in a very difficult situation, and Mrs. Joling as well as Mr. Joling have expressed repeatedly a desire to represent themselves. However, I think that they did not engage fully with Judge Hogan when he held the previous *Faretta* hearing, and on that basis he continued our representation. It was — and without getting into details,

 $I \, -- \, Mrs.$ Joling knows that if she wants to represent herself, she must say particular things to the court in order to have that happen.

With that, I am -- I have concluded my remarks, and whatever the court wants to do next is certainly in order.

THE COURT: Both lawyers on each of your behalf have stated where they think this issue is, so I am happy to hear anything either one of you wish to tell me.

DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: Thank you.

Notwithstanding, the facts that they say are basically correct except with a difference of opinion. I do not challenge their abilities or skills. As a Christian, I can't have ungodly representation, as the scripture clears, and they have made that clear to me.

But notwithstanding all those facts, we are really here today to end controversy, and so I will conditionally accept even the appointment of the attorneys, if that's your desire, and whatever may else be said on proof of the claim and on condition that a private administrative remedy that is in place and settled has not constituted closure and settlement of all this case, and I would move then to dismiss. We want — we do not want controversy any longer, and so that's where I am at today.

THE COURT: Ms. Joling.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DEFENDANT DOROTHEA JOLING: I also understand the court's concern for my representation. And I also conditionally accept the court's appointment -- appointed counsel on proof of claim and upon condition that my private administrative settlement does not constitute closure and settlement of this case, and therefore there will be no need of counsel upon completion of settlement. And I wish to have this case dismissed on those bases. THE COURT: Mr. Bradford. MR. BRADFORD: Your Honor, I am trying to interpret what the defendants just said. THE COURT: Well, they made a motion to dismiss. Are you prepared to dismiss? MR. BRADFORD: I am not prepared to dismiss. THE COURT: Motion is denied. So we are proceeding on the matter that's before this court. And you have indicated that you are taking -- you are conditionally accepting representation from the lawyers. This is a criminal charge filed in this court. We are following the Constitutional process under which these charges are brought in the -- under the rule of law. With the condition -- with the exception of motions that you just made on your own, your lawyers represent you. They are

skilled in this process. They are skilled in the rules of

law. They are skilled in the fact that the government has brought the charge against each of you, and we'll proceed.

It is important that you understand the peril of going forward on your own. It is a complicated, rule-driven, constitutional-driven proceeding all the way through. Many people have come here and said they will do it on their own, and we take that very seriously. People have the right to represent themselves, and we over and over and over and over and over and over again walk through the perils of that.

I would have to say on rare occasions people go forward on their own because the risks are substantial. It would appear to me that in this particular instance, you are being given the opportunity for two experienced, skilled advocates who understand this process, understand the charges, and will defend you with zeal and honesty. They will also tell you where those risks are. That's what their job happens to be.

And more often than not, when we are in this position we find people who are unable to hear the message and take it out on the messenger. The message today is this matter is filed in this court. I have not had a motion before this court that questions adequately jurisdiction on these claims. I appreciate the approach you have taken thus far. That the record -- I have a record of understanding and appreciating those motions. I have made my ruling on

```
that issue. You can ask your lawyers to bring others.
 1
 2
     this case will move forward.
 3
               And it is your -- in your best interest to
 4
     cooperate fully with the lawyers to either allow them the
 5
     opportunity to be ready for trial and/or be in a position
     where they can assist in a resolution, a negotiated
 6
 7
     resolution of this particular case short of that.
 8
               But those are -- that's the process. That's the
 9
     process.
10
               So what -- what are the outstanding dates at this
11
     point?
12
               MR. BRADFORD: Your Honor, we have a May 15th
     trial date, which is a Wednesday. That's the next date.
13
14
               MR. WEINTRAUB: There is a status conference set
15
     before Judge Hogan on April 15th.
               THE COURT: I don't think --
16
17
               MR. BANDIERO: Judge Coffin.
18
               MR. WEINTRAUB: Or -- excuse me -- Judge Coffin on
19
     April 15th.
20
               MR. BRADFORD: At this stage --
21
               MR. BANDIERO: Your Honor, I --
22
               MR. BRADFORD: Go ahead.
23
               MR. BANDIERO: After you finish with the
24
     scheduling, I just have --
25
               MR. BRADFORD: Go ahead, Mr. Bandiero.
```

MR. BANDIERO: Well, I think we need some more 1 2 clarity on I accept conditionally the representation. I am 3 not sure what conditionally means to Mrs. Joling. 4 So I would request that the court perhaps try to 5 clarify that issue. 6 THE COURT: That's a good question. But I gave --7 that's why I am asking for what schedule -- what schedule 8 might be -- what I need to know with regard to scheduling. 9 MR. BRADFORD: Your Honor, regarding the trial 10 date, typically we -- I am unclear as to why that was set 11 for a Wednesday, but if we were to hold that week as our 12 trial date, I would respectfully request that the court start the trial on Tuesday of that week. That would give us 13 14 more time to possibly complete the trial by that Friday. 15 THE COURT: Well, we'll have to be because I leave 16 the country that Saturday. 17 MR. BRADFORD: Even better. Thank you. 18 MR. WEINTRAUB: I don't think we will be prepared 19 for trial by that date in any event. 20 THE COURT: That was actually my expectation. MR. WEINTRAUB: Given the volume of discovery and 21 22 the lack of communication with the client, there is a great 23 deal more to do before we would be prepared for trial. But 24 I thought we could take that up with Judge Coffin as opposed 25 to Judge Hogan on April 15th.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BANDIERO: And for my part, Your Honor, it is very difficult to prepare a case when you get fired on a weekly basis and you really don't know whether you should continue slogging through all of the information that's there. And it's -- I can tell you that there's a lot. So I agree with Mr. Weintraub that I think that it's unrealistic to keep this trial date. MR. WEINTRAUB: And to be frank, because of ongoing budgetary issues, and I know the court's well aware of them, we have -- we have held back somewhat in devoting resources to this case because it was unclear whether we would really be staying on the case. At this point it is my intention not to move to withdraw further unless there is what appears to be a significant change in circumstances that would warrant that. And that is notwithstanding any future communications I get from Mr. Joling about whether or not I am or should be representing him. THE COURT: Um-hmm. Um-hmm. MR. WEINTRAUB: So we'll devote the resources we need to --THE COURT: Um-hmm. MR. WEINTRAUB: -- and prepare to defend the case, but we would not be ready by May. THE COURT: Go ahead. You have something to say?

DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: Yes. Notwithstanding everything, as I said earlier, and we have previously challenged jurisdiction. This has not been proved on the record. We could go through a long dissertation of the things that I have asked to be done that haven't been done.

But in regards to the Department of Justice and yourself, and thank you for the time to speak, I -- and the motion to dismiss and your certain sincere interest, I believe, in our defense and a proper defense and the dates for trials and so forth, notwithstanding all that, I still conditionally accept all of that on proof of claim and on condition that my private administrative settlement that is in place does not constitute a closure and settlement of all charges --

THE COURT: I have no idea what that means. What's your private -- what is that?

THE DEFENDANT: It's under the administrative acts that have already -- I believe everyone should have had a copy of it. It's been already sent to everyone.

THE COURT: What does that mean?

THE DEFENDANT: It's a private settlement outside the realm of the court in which I am getting the prosecutor and those who believe they have various charges to settle outside the court. And within — when that is completed, it would certainly be not necessary to have all the other

things that were --

THE COURT: Let me just ask a question. There -- as we know, there are two different aspects of the IRS office, one that deals with the collection matter and one that deals with the criminal matters, right? I mean, to just be roughly stated.

MR. BRADFORD: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And try as I might to come up with global settlements in those two arenas, generally it's very difficult to have a meeting of the minds of those two; is that correct?

MR. BRADFORD: Correct. Typically there is no global settlement in those types of cases.

THE COURT: So just as a hypothetical, for example, if Mr. Joling had submitted, let's say, back taxes due and owing for whatever period of time was claimed in the criminal case of just say a \$100,000, which happens to be the number, perhaps, that he owes, how would that impact the criminal case?

MR. BRADFORD: Typically a payment of taxes, once we have gotten to this stage where criminal conduct has occurred, will not settle the criminal case. It would be, for example, applied to restitution or something like that later on down the road, but it would not settle the criminal conduct at issue.

THE COURT: But it could impact how that's 1 2 resolved? 3 MR. BRADFORD: Potentially, yes, Your Honor. 4 I would simply note for the record that the information that 5 Mr. Joling is discussing have been provided to defense 6 counsel and to the IRS, and it's most appropriately described as frivolous tax protester information, which is 8 very difficult to understand and determine what the intent 9 of the defendant actually was in this case. 10 THE COURT: Can you be more specific? 11 MR. BRADFORD: The best way to do would be to 12 provide it to the court for the court to review, but it's 13 lots of paperwork that talks about secret accounts with the 14 treasury, the U.C.C., bogus bonds, bogus 1099 schemes and 15 those types of arguments to settle their tax debt. 16 THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Joling, here's what I 17 would tell you: 18 The government has the charges before this court, 19 the criminal charges. 20 DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: Go ahead. THE COURT: And you have provided information to 21 22 them that does not satisfy the answer to those criminal 23 elements and charges. By -- my example that I gave you was 24 a hopeful one that perhaps you were taking that tack that it 25 was a, oh, I did not realize that I owed X amount of money

and I will tender that amount of money and see if that will have an impact on the criminal case.

It appears that what you have filed are complicated documents that don't lead to the conclusion that there's a basis for a defense in this particular case.

That's just my rough reading of what you have stated.

So we proceed on the criminal case. And I am going to suggest that you work hand in glove with your lawyer to be prepared to answer these criminal charges because they are serious. They are — you are not the first person in the world to be charged and attempt to bring before the court these defenses. To the best of my knowledge, no one has been successful in the raising of the issues that you are raising, and that's gone beyond this court to make that determination.

So I am obligated to go forward. And what I will tell you is you are going to want a vigorous defense, and you are going to want to arm your lawyers with adequate information. The more you make it difficult and withhold that information or struggle with that, the more likely it is you are going to come into court ill-equipped to really respond to the government's evidence. And if you want your lawyers to be in a position to be able to adequately respond, they need to be prepared and you need to cooperate.

DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: Again, I appreciate -- I

sincerely feel, especially your early morning words to the 1 2 gentleman that was here, I feel your sincerity. I believe 3 that. You don't want to see a 70-year-old man and woman 4 married 50 years sent to jail. But 30 years of study and 5 research, I still feel that I -- and I would even testify 6 before the Lord under oath to the living God, I am innocent of all charges. We are innocent of all charges. We don't 8 want to, though, go to controversy and argue. The Lord says 9 agree with your enemy in the way. The documents that 10 Mr. Bradford was referring to are not the documents that 11 have been recently submitted. 12 THE COURT: Well, then you will have time to talk 13 it over with your lawyers and discuss that. 14 But here's what I need to tell you: We are a rule 15 of law country. And have you -- if you say you are 70 years 16 old, have you had any military service? 17 DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: No. 18 THE COURT: Have you -- did your kids go to 19 school? 20 DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: Christian school. THE COURT: Do you have kids? 21 22 THE DEFENDANT: Sure. 23 THE COURT: Went to school? 24 DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: In the Christian school, 25 private school.

THE COURT: Private school. 1 2 Do you drive on the roads? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. I don't drive. 4 travel on the road, but difference in law and --5 THE COURT: You know, we are -- we -- you have the 6 privilege of being part of a Democracy that is governed by a constitution that sets out how we will govern as a people. It's the rule of law. And everybody has the protection of 8 9 the First Amendment to worship how they wish to worship, but we all have our obligations and our responsibilities under 10 rule of law and the choice of living here, and those 11 12 obligations are taken seriously. This court takes those 13 obligations seriously. 14 And I am suggesting to you that I take no pleasure 15 in sending people to jail for any crime, but when they break 16 the law and they are held accountable because they have 17 violated the law, that's what happens. 18 So I am prepared to execute my oath in a way that 19 provides a fair trial for both the defense and the

So I am prepared to execute my oath in a way that provides a fair trial for both the defense and the government and to present this to your peers who will sit as jurors, and they will make their determination. But they will be given legal instruction about what the elements are of the crimes, and those elements, if proven, by a jury of your peers you may be found guilty.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would suggest that if you want to mount an

adequate and appropriate defense, this is the time to work with your lawyers.

DEFENDANT RONALD JOLING: I appreciate everything you have said. And I believe in the rule of law. Lived it myself. The law comes from scriptures, Public Law 97-280, and for you I believe it's House Joint Resolution 104.

However, with all due respect, please, I am not being argumentative, all respect, I conditionally accept whatever you feel is best in this case on the condition and proof of claim and the condition that this remedy, my private administrative remedy, which is permissible under the law under Title 28, Section 11, does not constitute closure and settlement of the case in a fair and equitable way which brings no damage to any party.

And so thank you very much. I appreciate your deep concern. I really do.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, you are still, as far as I am concerned -- go ahead, Mr. Bandiero.

MR. BANDIERO: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't want to belabor all of this and extend this hearing, but I think that we have heard from Mr. Joling, Mr. Weintraub's client, about conditional representation and acceptance, and the private remedies.

I think that Mr. Joling alluded to the fact that he asked to have things done, and I don't know what the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

correspondence between Mr. Joling and Mr. Weintraub have been, but I do know that I get essentially the same documents from Mrs. Joling because both names are on them. And the assertion that I have been asked to do things and have not done them is problematic in this way: Without going into the details, and it's very difficult to kind of dance around all of those things, I cannot either file motions or assert positions that are frivolous, and I refuse to do so. I am not essentially saying that they are frivolous, but in my opinion, I cannot file and I cannot follow the instructions given to me by my client. That's the first part of it. The second is I am not sure that we have had any clarity on conditional representation from Mrs. Joling. DEFENDANT DOROTHEA JOLING: Upon the court's advice, I conditionally accept the recommendation that he be retained as my attorney until the completion of my private administrative settlement is finished. THE COURT: Are you going to talk to your lawyer? DEFENDANT DOROTHEA JOLING: Yes. THE COURT: Um-hmm. THE DEFENDANT: Upon condition. THE COURT: What are those conditions? MR. BANDIERO: Stand to address Judge Aiken so that we can all hear you. Thank you.

DEFENDANT DOROTHEA JOLING: Until my private administrative settlement is completed, I will be conversing with Mr. Bandiero.

MR. BRADFORD: Your Honor, perhaps I can settle the issue. The private settlement has been rejected by the government and we'll proceed. We are happy to engage in settlement discussions with the defendants and their attorneys and whatever else the court would like us to do as far as a settlement goes, but their private action has been rejected by the government.

THE COURT: So that's where we stand. Motion to dismiss was denied. The government has rejected that conditional settlement. We are proceeding on the elements.

I am going to suggest to you that you cooperate fully with your lawyers and provide the information to provide an adequate and an appropriate defense in this case.

And I am just going to err on the side of maybe overstating something. I recently tried one of these cases to a jury verdict. And let's just say it was a fairly dominant husband in the situation who directed how things were going to be done. And the wife took the position that she just followed what her husband told her. Nonetheless, they were both convicted, and they both were sentenced.

You are separate and apart individuals before this court. And you are each entitled to your own approach and

defense. You have independent counsel.

You won't be housed together if you go to jail. I am going to suggest that you each have different approaches in this case, I suspect, and different opportunities to work with your lawyers, and you should take advantage of those because it won't matter at sentencing, if you get that far, if you are convicted, when all of a sudden there's a change of heart, as I had in my last case by the wife that she had no idea and she was just doing what her husband told her to do.

I am going to get ahead of that and say to you, I would understand right now that you have your own separate defense and your own separate issues and your own separate defense counsel, and you should take advantage of that.

I am not trying to divide either of you between the vow of marriage, but I am just going to suggest that you are going to be taken care of in respect to the law as separate individuals.

Anything else?

MR. BRADFORD: I just want to be clear here, Your Honor, because *Faretta* is one of those touchy issues when it goes up on appeal, and it's based on a record.

Is it possible to ask the defendants directly, yes or no, are they going to accept appointed counsel just because of the waiver and the conditional acceptance just to

ensure that that's clear on the record? 1 2 MR. WEINTRAUB: I don't think, if I may, that we 3 are going to get a clear answer on that, but my 4 understanding of the law is that unless they affirmatively 5 waive their Sixth Amendment right to counsel, then they will continue to be represented by counsel --6 THE COURT: Correct. 8 MR. WEINTRAUB: -- that is appointed by the court. 9 THE COURT: Correct. 10 MR. WEINTRAUB: And that's the record that we have 11 right now. 12 THE COURT: That's right. That's my understanding of the record. I have had to make these before. 13 14 Anything else, Mr. Bandiero? I -- you know, see, 15 here's the deal: 16 Both these lawyers are busy, have lots of 17 different clients, do excellent work, and they get stressed 18 if the clients are not cooperating and they are in a 19 position to do their very best work on your behalf. 20 would suggest to you that you cooperate fully with people 21 who understand the nature of these claims before the court, 22 these criminal charges, and can adequately defend you and to 23 look out for your interests and perhaps even resolve them 24 short of a trial. MR. WEINTRAUB: Our office will represent 25

Mr. Joling as well as we can under whatever the 1 2 circumstances are. 3 MR. BANDIERO: And on behalf of Ms. Joling, I want 4 to represent to the court and Mrs. Joling that I will do the 5 same. I am not sure if I heard Mr. Bradford --6 7 Mr. Bradford correctly, but I think he might have said that 8 a settlement, a noncriminal settlement is not available 9 That's -- you rejected that. But I think I heard him say that he would be available for a settlement 10 11 conference or anything else that the court directed. 12 So my question to the court is do you think -does the court and Mr. Bradford, Mr. Weintraub and of course 13 14 Mrs. Joling, would they want to engage in such an effort? 15 THE COURT: Well, first of all, I think we 16 outlined that there's the civil side of the IRS and the criminal side of the IRS, and we have had -- try as I might, 17 18 I have had a very difficult time trying to globally resolve 19 those two issues, although we have been able to do some 20 things sequentially, number one. 21 So he's ruled out because he has no authority to 22 resolve the civil side. 23 MR. BANDIERO: Yes, I understand. 24 THE COURT: I think the door is completely open to

have a conversation about resolving these three criminal

25

charges that are -- have been brought against the respective 1 2 defendants. 3 And you will have Judge Coffin at a status 4 conference, and you can certainly ask if he'd be willing to 5 engage in a negotiation because sometimes it's helpful to 6 have that third party. I am not going to burden Judge Coffin with a 8 conference that might not go anywhere, so I think that's 9 something you should talk with your clients about because I don't think it's a good use of his time to have your clients 10 11 go in and repeat over and over again the position they took. 12 They need to come to the table and be ready to address how 13 they are going to find their way out of these charges before 14 them short of a trial. Okay? 15 MR. BANDIERO: Very well. 16 THE COURT: All right? Thank you for your time 17 this morning. 18 MR. BRADFORD: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 MR. BANDIERO: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 MR. WEINTRAUB: Thank you. THE CLERK: Court is in recess. 21 22 (The proceedings were concluded this 23 19th day of March, 2013.) 24 25

```
I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and
 1
     correct transcript of the oral proceedings had in the
 2
 3
     above-entitled matter, to the best of my skill and ability,
     dated this 22nd day of March, 2013.
 4
 5
     /s/Kristi L. Anderson
 6
     Kristi L. Anderson, Certified Realtime Reporter
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```